1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
6		
7		
8	CHRISTIAN DOSCHER,	
9	Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C13-5457 BHS
10	v.	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO PROCEED <i>IN FORMA PAUPERIS</i>
11	PUBLIC STORAGE, et al.,	AND DISMISSING COMPLAINT
12	Defendants.	
13		
14	This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Christian Doscher's ("Doscher")	
15	motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Dkt. 1) and proposed complaint (Dkts. 1-2 & 1-3)	
16	("Complaint").	
17	On June 10, 2013, Doscher filed the instant motion and the proposed complaint	
18	asserting state law causes of action. Complaint, § R. Doscher argues that the Court has	
19	jurisdiction to hear this case because the parties are diverse and the amount in	
20	controversy is in excess of the jurisdictional limit. <i>Id.</i> § B. One of the Defendants,	
20	controversy is in excess of the jurisdictional lin	mit. <i>Id.</i> § B. One of the Defendants,
21	controversy is in excess of the jurisdictional line however, Sue Maltempi, is a resident of Washi	

1 The district court may permit indigent litigants to proceed *in forma pauperis* upon completion of a proper affidavit of indigency. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a). However, the "privilege of pleading in forma pauperis . . . in civil actions for damages should be allowed only in exceptional circumstances." Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328 (9th Cir. 1986). Moreover, the court has broad discretion in denying an application to proceed in forma pauperis. Weller v. Dickson, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963), cert. denied 375 U.S. 845 (1963). "If the court determines at any time that it lacks subject-matter jurisdiction, the court must dismiss the action." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3). In this case, Doscher has failed to meet his burden to proceed in forma pauperis. While Doscher may qualify financially, the Court does not have jurisdiction to hear this case because there is not complete diversity between the parties. Therefore, the Court **DENIES** the motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and **DISMISSES** the complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 12th day of June, 2013. United States District Judge

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22